

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-16, 18, 19, and 25-29 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claim 1 has been amended as shown on page 2 of the reply. The amendment addresses informalities as indicated in the Office Action. As no new matter or limitations have been introduced, entry of this amendment is respectfully requested. Applicant's representative thanks Examiner Pesin for the courtesies extended during the telephone interview on November 3, 2008. Distinctions between the cited references and the claims were discussed; however, no agreement was reached. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Objection to Claim 1

Claim 1 is objected to because of informalities. Claim 1 has been amended. In view of the amendment, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims 1, 4, 6, 10-13, 16, 18, 19, 25, 26, and 28 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 4, 6, 10-13, 16, 18, 19, 25, 26, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Clauss et al. (US 6,363,503) in view of Jenkins et al. (US 6,002,868) further in view of Rohall et al. (US 7,392,280). It is requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. The cited references, when taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all aspects recited in the subject claims.

[T]he prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all claim limitations. See MPEP §706.02(j). See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). See *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). [W]hen the prior art teaches away from combining certain known elements, discovery of a successful means of combining them is more likely to be non-obvious. See *KSR v. Teleflex*, 550 U.S. ___, 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007) citing *United States v. Adams*, 383 U. S. 39, 51-52 (1966). A factfinder should be aware, of course, of the distortion caused by hindsight bias and must be cautious of arguments reliant upon *ex post* reasoning. See *KSR v. Teleflex*, 550 U.S. ___, 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007) citing *Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City*, 383 U. S. 1, 36 (warning against a “temptation to read into the prior art the teachings of the invention in issue” and instructing courts to ““guard against slipping into the use of hindsight”” (*quoting Monroe*

Auto Equipment Co. v. Heckethorn Mfg. & Supply Co., 332 F. 2d 406, 412 (CA6 1964)).

The claimed subject matter relates to facilitating designation of appropriate responses to system events. Upon the occurrence of a system event, message components are received. Message components include a plurality of messages specifying context and a rationale relating to the event and/or an aspect of the event. Messages components can provide multiple levels of information, such as, for example, information at a high level, information at a low level, and information at other levels therebetween. To this end, independent claim 1 recites *a computer-implemented interactive user messaging system comprising a processor coupled to memory, the processor executes a receiver component that receives a message component corresponding to an event, the event includes at least one of an error, a determination of potential for an error, or an information prompt, the message component includes a plurality of messages, each message from the plurality of messages relates to at least a part of the event, the message component hierarchically organizes the plurality of messages from a high level description of the event to a low level description of the event, each message of the plurality of messages comprises a context component that provides a user context regarding an operational source of the message and a rationale component that provides a reason for the message and an assist component that provides a plurality of menu items corresponding to respective messages in the plurality of messages of the message component, each menu item includes a link to an informational source that provides at least one of information or a corrective action associated with the corresponding message, the corresponding message is highlighted as a user hovers on a respective menu item.* The cited references do not teach or suggest such aspects.

Clauss et al. relates to a processing and representing error messages within a computer-aided design environment. A function that results in an error when executing stores the error in a central storage location. Any calling functions that called the failed function do not add its own error message to the storage location. (*See* col. 4, ll. 7-42). The error is displayed in a hierarchical manner where each level of the display hierarchy is a different level of information. (*See* col. 6, ll. 1-3). While the display includes a help button (*See* 422, 472 and 540 of Figs. 4 and 5), the button is a mechanism to enable a user to request additional help (*See* col. 5, ll. 44-47 and col. 6, ll. 38-40). As conceded in the subject Final Office Action, a help button is not a

plurality of menu items but rather a mechanism to assert a request for additional information. Moreover, the help button does not provide a list of menu items corresponding to the message displayed. Rather, the help button remains constant regardless of the error information presented.

Jenkins et al. is relied upon to cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Clauss et al. with respect to independent claim 1. Jenkins et al. relates to a diagnostic application that includes a plurality of independent test modules. A front end module issues commands to lower level modules. In addition, a test definition tool is disclosed that facilitates visual development of test scripts via moving icons from one list to another. (*See Abstract*). Diagnostic library modules can be dispatched and controlled by higher level modules. Diagnostic library modules can identify hardware devices, specify tests, and execute tests. An error handler module is provided that retains error information gathered by diagnostic library modules. Error information can be provided to a user. In addition, a recommended action module retains information on what to do to fix an error. This information is employed by an error handler to recommend an action or response. (*See col. 7, ln. 46 – col. 8, ln. 39*). A front end module can display errors and actions. (*See col. 8, ll. 46-48*). The cited reference discloses retaining error information and recommended action information and generically displaying such information. However, the reference does not teach or suggest providing a plurality of menu items corresponding to respective messages in a plurality of messages wherein each menu item includes a link to informational sources. Rather, Jenkins et al. generically mentions display of error and recommended action information.

Moreover, in the Office Action, it is stated that Clauss et al. and Jenkins et al. do not teach or suggest highlighting a message as recited in claim 1. Rohall et al. is relied upon to make up for these deficiencies. Rohall et al. relates to summarizing email message threads. In particular, Rohall et al. discloses presentation of an email summary when a user clicks on an email message or hovers over an email message. This selection or hovering in Rohall et al. triggers a display of an email summary (e.g., a presentation of content associated with the selected or hovered object). In the claimed subject matter, hovering on a menu item (e.g., a link to an informational source) results in the corresponding message in the hierarchically organized plurality of messages. Accordingly, Rohall et al. relates to triggering a display of content

associated with an email message via selection or hover while the claimed subject matter relates to highlighting already displayed information that is associated with a menu item.

Independent claim 13 recites, in part, *means for formatting a user interface based upon format information in the plurality of messages*. As stated supra, Clauss et al. relates to mechanism for error handling, reporting and representation. Clauss et al. discloses an error reporting user that can include various graphical elements such as an exclamation point in a triangle to signify an error and a plus symbol to indicate that additional information is available via a single help button. (See col. 6, ll. 25-37). However, Clauss et al. does not teach or suggest formatting the user interface in accordance with format information included in the plurality of messages as recited in claim 13. Rather, Clauss et al. discloses displaying an interface in accordance with an arbitrary pre-developed interface format and is silent regarding formatting in accordance with information included in messages. Rohall et al. and Jenkins et al. fail to cure the aforementioned deficiencies.

In addition, independent claim 16 recites, in part, *analyzing format information included in the message component, the format information specifies graphical objects and associated functionality that are to be available to a user in a user interface employed to display the list of messages*. Similarly, claim 12, which depends from claim 1, recites *a format component that formats a user interface employed to display messages in accordance with format information included in the messages component, the format information includes graphical objects and associated functionality that are to be available to a user*. As described above, Clauss et al. discloses a particular interface format and fails to teach or suggest messages including format information that specifies graphical objects and associated functionality available to a user in a user interface. Clauss et al. fails to teach or suggest such customizability of an interface that displays messages. Rather, Clauss et al. employs a rigid, preset interface design.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the invention as recited in independent claim 1, 13 and 16 (and associated dependent claims). Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

III. Rejection of Claims 5 and 27 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 5 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over

Clauss et al., Jenkins et al. and Rohall et al. in view of Pangburn (US 7,152,226). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claim 5 depends from independent claim 1 and claim 27 depends from claim 16. Pangburn does not cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Clauss et al., Jenkins et al. and Rohall et al. with respect to independent claims 1 and 16.

IV. Rejection of Claims 7-8, 14, and 29 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 7-8, 14, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Clauss et al., Jenkins et al. and Rohall et al. in view of Pittore (US 6,414,699). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claims 7, 8, 14 depend from claim 1 and claim 29 depends from independent claim 16. Pittore does not cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Clauss et al., Jenkins et al. and Rohall et al. with respect to independent claims 1 and 16.

V. Rejection of Claim 9 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Clauss et al., Jenkins et al. and Rohall et al. in view of Boulton et al. (US 5,566,291). is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claim 9 depends from independent claim 1. Boulton et al. does not cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Clauss et al., Jenkins et al. and Rohall et al. with respect to independent claim 1.

VI. Rejection of Claim 15 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Clauss et al., Jenkins et al. and Rohall et al. in view of Spellman et al. (US 6,667,747). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claim 15 depends from independent claim 13 and Spellman et al. does not cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Clauss et al., Jenkins et al. and Rohall et al. with respect to independent claim 13.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP618US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Evan T. Perry/
Evan T. Perry
Reg. No. 62,190

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
57TH Floor, Key Tower
127 Public Square
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731